CRM Bulletin
Cultural Resources Management
A National Park Service Technical Bulletin
Vol. 4, Nos. 2-4
December 1981

Curatorial Division Takes on New Functions

Ann Hitchcock

The Curatorial Services Division, Washington, headed by Chief Curator Ann Hitchcock, has been expanded to include seven staff members formerly with the Museum Services Division of the Harpers Ferry Center. This transfer is a part of the general reorganization of the National Park Service instituted in June of 1981. The transferred staff will remain at Harpers Ferry and will be referred to as the Harpers Ferry Office of the Curatorial Services Division.

The Curatorial Services Division now has the following three primary functions:

1. The Park Assistance Program - including Collection Preservation Guides, Conserv-O-Grams, the Clearinghouse, the supply and equipment program, and general curatorial advisory and assistance programs for parks;
2. The National Catalog; and
3. Policy and Training.

The Branch of Conservation Laboratories, also formerly a part of the Museum Services Division, will remain under the direction of the Harpers Ferry Center. (All inquiries relating to conservation techniques, contracting, and services should continue to be directed to the Division of Conservation Laboratories, HFC. Objects sent for treatment should go to the Registrar, Division of Conservation Laboratories.)

The staff and its functions transferred to the Washington Office are as follows:

ADMINISTRATION -HARPERS FERRY OFFICE

Deputy Chief Curator - Art Allen.

Supervises the Harpers Ferry Office of the Curatorial Services Division; serves as principal staff advisor to Chief Curator; participates directly in the Park Assistance Program; and operates the Clearinghouse.

Secretary - Vacant.

Provides administrative and clerical support to the Harpers Ferry Office and assists in the evaluation and completion of museum records.

POLICY AND TRAINING

Coordinator of Policy and Training Tom Vaughan.

Evaluates Servicewide needs for collections management and conservation policies and guidelines, and coordinates the development of new or revised documents; evaluates Servicewide curatorial training needs and develops appropriate training programs; and serves as liaison among the curatorial, conservation, and exhibit functions at Harpers Ferry.

PARK ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Staff Curator (Museum Management) Diana Pardue

Coordinates the production of Collection Preservation Guides and Conserv-O-Grams; contributes to Furnishing Plans by writing Section F of these plans; responds to request

from parks for information and services; and assists in the operation of the Clearinghouse.

Museum Technician - Don Cumberland.

Advises parks on storage and maintenance of museum collections; operates program to lend environmental monitoring and other museum equipment to parks; coordinates program to furnish supplies and equipment to parks; and researches and maintains product information on curatorial supplies and equipment.

NATIONAL CATALOG

Museum Registrar - Gordon Gay.

Coordinates development of policy and procedures for the National Catalog; and reviews and maintains the centralized records for the Catalog. Emphasis is on development of a streamlined catalog system.

File Clerk - Libby Allen.

Provides clerical and administrative support; and reviews, maintains, and controls access to National Catalog card files.

The staff of the Harpers Ferry Office of the Curatorial Services Division will be moving out of Shipley School into new space in Harpers Ferry Park. The National Catalog and Clearinghouse functions will remain in their present location in the Bomb Shelter attached to the Mather Training Center. New telephone numbers and office addresses will be issued when the move is completed. All formal correspondence to the Division should be directed to the Chief Curator, WASO (41s), or the Associate Director, Cultural Resources Management, WASO (400), as appropriate. Informal inquiries and telephone requests for assistance should be directed to the responsible staff in the Harpers Ferry Office.

The augmented division staff looks forward to continuing its curatorial advisory and service functions to the regions and parks, while placing increased emphasis on the development of Servicewide policy, guidelines and standards for management of museum collections. The integration of the advisory and policy functions will strengthen the curatorial program and provide better guidance to the regions and field personnel in curatorial matters. CRM

The author is Chief Curator of the National Park Service.

Historic Structures of the National Park Service

Travis C. McDonald, Jr.

A survey of National Park Service architecture would not be complete without referring to two distinct building types not mentioned in the first half of this article (see CRM BULLETIN, Vol.4, No. 1, March, 1981, p.l). They are fortifications and monuments.

The history of U.S. fortifications is not unlike that of domestic architecture in regard to traditions, adaptations, and the evolution of building. The chronology of fortifications is roughly parallel to that of domestic architecture: temporary seventeenth century forts gave way to more permanent structures in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; crude frontier forts pushed westward; and standardized forts were constructed in the nineteenth century.

European fort forms were transplanted in the New World just as domestic architecture had been. There were vast differences between a fortified city in Spain and a log palisade in Florida, but the basic form was recognizable. The bastioned system developed in Europe in the sixteenth century was employed throughout colonial and territorial America well into the nineteenth century. Precision, scale, and material were all relative; wooden stockades could just as easily defend against arrows as thick masonry could against cannon. Most forts established for territorial defense were complete building evolutions in themselves. Castillo de San Marcos well illustrates this process. In 1565, a successive series of nine wooden forts were begun by the Spanish at St. Augustine, Florida, all falling victim to fire, weather, attack, and shoddy construction. Eventually, a more permanent fort was constructed beginning in 1672 when labor was available to quarry the native coquinal. The same building stage process occurred at nearby Fort Mantanzas (1740-1742), and also at the sixteenth century Spanish forts of the walled city of San Juan, Puerto Rico. English colonists, ever pushing to subdue the wilderness and the Indians, constructed crude palisaded forts such as that at Fort Raleigh, North Carolina (1585-1587).

The European wars in America (1689–1763) were responsible for establishing a great number of temporary fortifications in the eighteenth century. Fort Stanwix, New York, was one of the more permanently constructed examples (although it disappeared and has been reconstructed, based on historic archeological excavations and a historic documents search). Built of logs in a crib fashion by the British in 1758, the fort site was occupied and the fort rebuilt by the American patriots during the Revolutionary War.

At the close of the eighteenth century, the United States felt the need for a permanent system of fortifications. Despite this concerted effort to systematize forts, these first system forts (1794 1804) were non-uniform in design. Fort McHenry in Baltimore Harbor survives from this early period.

Replacing a Revolutionary War earthen fort, a French engineer, Jean Foncin, designed the new structure as a masonry and earthen five-bastioned pentagonal form containing barracks, quarters, and a magazine.

With the threat of war in 1807, a second system of permanent forts was begun, not dissimilar to those of the first system, with the exception of using bombproof brick vaults and casemates. Examples from this period include: Fort Moultrie, South Carolina (18071811); Castle Clinton, New York (18081811); and Fort Washington, Maryland (1824), the latter being transitional with the third system forts.

Third system forts (1817-1875) were not hastily constructed by war threats and are consequently more massive and better constructed. A professional board oversaw the design, construction, and reconstruction of these forts (twenty-four of the pre- 181s forts were reconstructed earlier forts). These forts usually had massive earth, sand-, or

concrete-faced brick or stone parapets. Most of these were polygonal with four to seven faces, most had bastions, multitiered casemates, and a barbette tier. Third system forts include: Fort Pulaski, Georgia (1829–1847); Fort Jefferson, Florida (184s1874); and Fort Point, California (1853- 1861).

By the mid-nineteenth century, America, with the exception of Russia, had taken the lead in coastal defense fortification technology. Innovations in embrasure construction and rifled cannon changed fortifications during and immediately after the Civil War. New fortifications after this time tended to be separate earth-covered batteries as primary defense, a shift in emphasis from forts to weaponry. Thereafter, forts were updated by new concrete emplacements, frequently at isolated coastal sites, bringing an end to the familiar, bastioned fort.

Ironically though, as masonry fortifications were being refined, wooden stockade, earthen or adobe forts and posts still marched across the interior of the continent, providing protection for western settlers. Familiar western forts such as Fort Davis, Texas (18541891), Fort Union, New Mexico (18511891), adapted to the less sophisticated technology of Indian warfare.

Monuments and memorials comprise the other distinctive architectural type largely associated with the National Park Service. (The word monument is used here in the classic definition and not as a type of park area.) Monuments were erected to commemorate a significant person, place, or event, and were designed by architects, conforming to one of the architectural styles discussed earlier in this article. Two broad categorical types can be identified: the freestanding mono/megalithic object; and the space enclosing monument. Both of these types are narrowly defined as monuments, the former bordering as sculpture, and the latter arguably can be called a building. Of the freestanding object types, three of the earliest monuments now in the Park System were designed in the Egyptian Revival Style as obelisks: the Bunker Hill Monument (1825-1842); the Washington Monument (1848-1885); and the Chalmette Monument (1855). The Surrender Monument at Saratoga, New York, is also worth noting as an eclectic style obelisk with High Victorian Gothic details. A Colonial Revival example of the object type is the Dorchester Heights Memorial Tower near Boston. Designed as a neo-Georgian church tower by Peabody and Sterns in 1897, It stands much like a campanile.

In many cases, these commemorative monuments were designed by nationally famous architects either by commission or by competition and are usually symbolic in form. Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial (1912-1915), on South Bass Island in Lake Erie, 1s in the shape of a giant Doric column, obviously representing strength since that is the symbolic character of the Doric Order. Other monuments were designed in a more abstract form, such as the Wright Brothers Memorial (1928-1932), symbolizing flight. The ultimate Park Service monument in an abstract form is that of the Gateway Arch in St. Louis. Designed by the innovative architect, Eero Saarinen in 1967, the s30-foot steel arch symbolizing the nation's westward expansion can only be described as sublime.

The space enclosing monuments seem to have been a popular type during the American Renaissance period. Classically inspired Beaux-Arts temple monuments were frequently used in memorializing past presidents: The General (;rant National Memorial (1897) in New York; the Lincoln Memorial (19191922), in Washington , D.C.; the Abraham

Lincoln Birthplace National Historic Site (1909); and the Jefferson Memorial (1943) in the nation's capital, perhaps, the last great Beaux- Arts structure in the United States. Smaller versions can also be found in military cemeteries such as at Gettysburg with its Renaissance-domed Pennsylvania State Memorial (1910), or at Vicksburg with its pantheonic Illinois State Monument (190s).

This article has attempted to call attention to the rich variety of architectural resources found within the National Park System. The responsibility that accompanies such a stewardship is enormous. Basic maintenance to preserve these resources, and their interpretation, is an all-consuming task. The responsibility for historic structures also

\carries the burden of maintaining currency in preservation techniques and philosophy. The Park Service has a proud heritage of dealing with its resources. Many restoration projects have become case examples because of the painstaking care Park Service professionals have taken.

The Service's preservation projects also mirror the maturation of the historic preservation movement in the United States. Mistakes that were made, such as the urban renewal (urban removal?) trends to landscape parks in urban sites in St. Louis and Philadelphia, have hopefully become lessons well learned, as they have been in the private sector. And as articles and letters in the CRM BULLETIN have observed, practices such as full-scale reconstructions have become passé in the general preservation movement, and should be so also in the Park Service. Scarce funds that can hardly be stretched to keep original fabric standing cannot be justified for the reconstruction of lost examples of architecture. Considering the limited funds available for historic structures, priorities based on a total scope of resources must be made. The Park Service has made strides in improving its methods for identifying needs and in allocating funds and personnel to remedy these needs. It has begun using computerized programs to handle the vast amounts of data needed to keep tabs on its extensive holdings; and it is attempting to raise needed funds for meeting its preservation responsibilities through such innovative programs as renting out historic properties for commercial purposes.

The author, holds a graduate degree in architectural history from the University of Virginia, and does consultant work on both public and private preservation projects. He previously served on the Historic Architecture Division staff in Washington.

Research in Progress

The CRM BULLETIN will publish notices, on a regular basis, of National Park Service sponsored cultural resources management methodology/technology research in progress, as well as abstracts of this research. Notices and abstracts should be sent to the Editor. Questions on the status of any of the research projects listed below should be a~ dressed to the Division of Historic Architecture (408), National Park Service, Washington, D.C. 20240, or by calling 202- 523- 0091.

Development of a Mortar Selection System. North Atlantic Historic Preservation Center (Boston); Historic Architecture Division, WAS0.

Development of a mortar selection system based on hardness (mix), sand type, and color.

Literature Search on Use of Sealants in Masonry Joints. National Bureau of Standards; Historic Architecture Division, WAS0.

Literature search on the use of sealants in masonry joints and preparation of an abstract that summarizes the positive and negative factor of this technique.

Tombstone Study.

New York University/ Institute of Fine Arts; Environmental Protection Agency; Veterans Administration; and Historic Architecture Division, WAS0.

Study of Veterans Administration and NPS maintained tombstones to determine how air pollution affects deterioration of stone.

NAT0-CCMS (Committee for Challenges to Modern Society) Monument Pilot Study.

Environmental Protection Agency; North Atlantic Historic Preservation Center; Historic Architecture Division, WAS0.

Correlation of monitoring IRMA equipment to effectively measure air and rain qualities with inexpensive methods at Federal Hall National Memorial.

Laboratory Testing of Stone Consolidants.

National Bureau of Standards; Historic Architecture Division, WAS0.

Conclusion of a multi-year laboratory testing program to evaluate the performance and durability of stone consolidants, for the development of selection criteria based on performance considerations, and the publication of a "Technical Note" describing the testing and results.

Field Testing of Acrylic Resin Stone Consolidants. North Atlantic Historic Preservation Center; Historic Architecture Division, WAS0.

Field testing of acrylic resin stone consolidants on historic stone materials.

Testing of the Effects of Pressurized Aggregate Cleaning on Masonry Substrates.

North Atlantic Historic Preservation Center; Preservation Assistance Division, WAS0.

Literature search and laboratory testing to analyze and quantify the degree of damage (or loss of surface area) caused by a predetermined variety of abrasive grits applied under pressure to selected types of historic masonry.

Study of Paint Pigments. North Atlantic Historic Preservation Center; Historic Architecture Division, WAS0.

Study of paint pigments, their formulation on paint colors, characteristics of fading and other color change, and the development of simple tests for determining the composition of basic color types found in structure paints.

Study of Modern Paint Equivalents. North Atlantic Historic Preservation Center; Historic Architecture Division, WAS0.

Study of a 19th-century paint sample from Salem to determine the prominence of various colors and basic pigment types.

Cultural and Historic Landscape Study. Kansas State University, Department of Landscape Architecture; Historic Architecture Division, WAS0.

Second year of a multi-year study to develop and design criteria and guidelines for identifying and evaluating cultural and historic landscapes within the National Park System through field testing.

A Quick Introduction to Collections: For Managers

Thomas G. Vaughan

WARNING! The following material is classified as Management Eyes Only! Any curators caught reading it will be considered permanently tainted with a knowledge and awareness of management concerns.

Superintendents and division chiefs are often hard put for time. They juggle and balance and try to smoothly mesh a wide variety of functions at the park level. In most cases, their background is not curatorial, so developing an awareness of curatorial problems takes a little more effort than it does for other activities.

Folks doing curatorial work may, at times, be equally unaware of the range of forces tugging on the manager. The result may be conversations like one that a superintendent said he had with his curator: "I asked for the time of day, and he gave me a tour of the watch factory!"

So the following outline is designed to give managers an easy and quick (one hour) insight into the management of their parks ' collections. It 's no panacea, but it may be an eye opener .

Records (15 Minutes)

Pick any run of the mill object in storage or on exhibit.

1. Is it cataloged (can you prove it belongs to the Park Service)?
2. Will the catalog card tell you anything about the object (is the card adequately filled out) ?
3. Ask how may objects need to be cataloged to meet the standard of having all objects in the collection cataloged. If there is a need, what plans and programs are in effect to get the task accomplished?
4. When was the last annual inventory completed? Can you be sure it is still correct, that all the objects for which you are responsible are still present or accounted for?
5. Do you have an approved scope of collections statement? Is it being implemented? Will you (can you) provide active care in perpetuity for everything that scope would allow?

Worst Storage Tour (15 Minutes)

Ask to see the storage area that has objects in the worst environment.

1. Why is it worst? (Not secure, open to elements, dirty, uncontrolled environment, liable to flooding, fire hazards, etc.).
2. Have you seen this place before? If the need is major, has the regional curator seen it? The regional director?
3. What is needed to provide storage at standard for the objects here and in the rest of your collection? Are these needs documented and already in the program and budget cycle? What remains to be done?

Routine Care & Maintenance (15 Minutes)

Go through your major exhibit area.

1. Are objects dusty?
2. Are objects protected from theft or abuse by operations which are security conscious? How about at night ?
3. What is the record of loss or damage for objects in this area?
4. Are light, temperature, and humidity levels acceptable in this area?
5. Is there a maintenance program in effect for this area?

s. What deficiencies have you noted?

What is being done to bring things up to standard?

Rap-up (15 Minutes)

Talk with your curator about what you have just seen.

1. Is curation part of the employee's performance standards? Should it be?
2. What is the total size of your collection?
3. What is the value of your collection?
4. What is the number of objects needing cataloging?
5. What is the number of objects needing improved storage?

s. What is the number of objects needing conservation treatment?

7. What does this person see as the three top problems of the collection? How are priorities being set to solve those problems? Have the necessary programming and budgeting documents been prepared to make the solutions happen?

Afterthoughts (This may take more time.)

What to do with the results of the hour with the curator? Well, of course, every manager will have his or her own solutions, but there are a few general tips that can be offered. One of the most common oversights (not just in curation) is the failure to justify and request, on the appropriate programming and budgeting forms, the resources needed to solve management problems. The guidance and support of management and administration may be needed. The "hour" may identify areas of mutual concern for the manager and curator to follow up on later, thus nurturing and focusing the dialogue. Finally, if a lot of the questions asked result in "don't know" or "beats me," call the regional curator for professional assistance.

The author is Coordinator of Policy and Training for the Harpers Ferry Office of the Curatorial Services Division, WASO.

Would You Like to Help Preserve this Historic Structure?

The Williamsport Preservation Training Center, Maryland, is offering four, two-week training courses for craftspersons and professionals during FY ~3. Training will be a "hands-on experience for those who wish to learn the "nuts and bolts" of building preservation.

Courses being offered are

1. Timber Framing - large mortise and tendon repair and replacement; hewing; material and tool selection; cost estimating; organizing work program.
2. Masonry Repairs - stone and brick replacement; repointing; mortar; selection of tools and material; cost estimating; organizing work program.
3. Historic Millwork Restoration - repair and duplication; epoxy consolidation; molding reproduction; material identification and selection; cost estimating.
4. Structure Inspection - How to read a building; to evaluate existing conditions; to determine causes for deterioration; preparing preservation program, including cost estimates and special consideration.

Watch for training announcements or contact the Williamsport Preservation Training Center, Maryland (301) 223787 2.

Razing the Roost—Health Hazards from Pigeons

Mary V. Maruca

Pigeons may be pests and public nuisances, but Americans have lived peace fully with these feathered friends of the urban airways until recently. New discoveries have brought this camaraderie between man and bird under closer scrutiny. Urbanites are raising the roof over one of the birds ' less endearing habits. Exposure to pigeon droppings has proven to be a very real health hazard

Pigeon dung in old buildings is fertile ground for pathogenic fungi, which can cause cryptococcosis or histoplasmosis, both potentially fatal diseases of the lungs and central nervous system. Flu-like symptoms of lung infection include low-grade fever and mild cough. Cryptococal meningitis, a disease of the central nervous system, is marked by sudden excruciating head of build- aches, vomiting, vertigo, and dizziness. Persons with a history of lung ailments, diabetes, and other under lying diseases, or those undergoing steroid therapy are most susceptible AA to cryptococcosis or histoplasmosis.

Because the disease-causing organisms are airborne, coveralls or other protective clothing and footwear should be worn and then disposed of after working in an area where birds have been roosting. A breathing mask for screening out particles one micron or greater should be the last item removed after leaving a contaminated building.

Often, the disease may not develop until years after contact. If you have already entered a building where pigeon droppings have accumulated, have your physician test you for these two diseases. They can be treated successfully if diagnosed early. If your local health department is unable to perform the tests, you may want to contact Robert K. Weeks at the Center for Disease Control, U.S. Public Health Service, Atlanta, GA 30333 (telephone: 404 329- 3547).

The author is a writer-editor for the Associate Director, Cultural Resources Management, WASO, and is the Assistant Editor for the CRM BULLETIN.

Fund Raising

F. Ross Holland, Jr.

Over the next couple of years, the nation is going to hear a great deal about the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island. The purpose for this publicity is fund raising- collecting money from the private sector to repair and rehabilitate the Statue of Liberty and the principal historic structures at Ellis Island. This work is to be completed by 1986, in time for the centennial celebration of the dedication of the Statue of Liberty.

The funds that need to be raised are at a level that only a Pentagon budget analyst is used to dealing with, and although there are some who doubt this amount can be raised through private donation, I am optimistic and think that it can and will be done. I feel that way primarily because there is 80 much enthusiasm for these important historic sites. A large number of people are virtually beating down the Service's door, requesting that they be allowed to raise funds for one of these two sites. One large company, for example, wants to conduct an advertising sales campaign by which the Statue of Liberty will benefit. A prominent sculptor is doing thirty pieces depicting various facets of the immigrants ' experience for permanent use at Ellis Island. His work will be exhibited around the country, along with paintings by famous artists, to raise the national consciousness about Ellis Island and the Statue of Liberty. When I think about these things and the prominent citizens who have enlisted in the support of this effort, I glow with optimism.

The Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island are special sites to millions upon millions of Americans. Indeed, the Statue of Liberty is probably the best known sculpture in the world. Because they are 80 well known and because of the emotions they evoke, it will be less difficult to raise large amounts of money than it would be for the nation's other historic sites. But many of these sites do have their constituents who would be willing to do something to help that site.

Just recently, for example, at the Cultural Resources Coalition meeting in Washington, one participant voiced his objection an ineffective audiovisual program at one of the Civil War parks. The Division of History and the Division of Interpretation checked out the program and reported to the Director that the constituent's objection was valid. Unfortunately, due to funding limitations, making another program for the park was unlikely. Chief Historian Ed Bearss informed the constituent of our findings and asked if his organization would be willing to pay for a new audiovisual program for the park. The upshot was that the organization was willing, and had expectations of raising the full amount needed.

The point to these examples is that as managers, we need to keep our minds open to new and imaginative ways of doing things other than through the Federal budget.

CRM The author is the Associate Director, Cultural Resources Management, WASO.

Bulletin Resumes Publication

At last, we have our voice back. We can now resume our exchange of ideas and experiences in the realm c cultural resources management.

Since we have been out of print well over a year, perhaps this would be an appropriate time to restate the intent of the BULLETIN. It is simple. This publication is not a vehicle to issue dictums from Washington. It is a vehicle for the parks, the Service Centers, the Regions, and Washington to communicate to the rest of the Park Service, their views, technological improvements, techniques of preservation, and those myriad other things that are embraced in cultural resources management. It is our means of sharing what we have learned.

It's nice to be back in print! FRH Jr.

From the Editor's Desk

This issue 18 numbered Vol.4, Nos. 2- 4 in order to complete the quarterly numbering for calendar year 1981. Our September, 1982 issue will be identified with Vol. 5, Nos. 1-3. In so numbering these two "catch-up" issues, libraries and individuals will readily know they have complete files of the BULLETIN.

If you have any questions or suggestions on topics or other matters relating to the BULLETIN, please address them to the Editor. Enough said; It’s good to be back in business